

Application No.: 10/646,306  
Docket No.: UC0206USNA

Page 5

### **REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the Examiner's rejection in the Office Action dated February 8, 2006 and are presented in support of Applicants' request to reconsider and reexamine the pending claims. Applicants confirm election of the invention of Group I, claims 1-20, as per the Examiner's telephone conference with attorney Mary Ann Capria. Applicants affirm the election without traverse.

#### ***Status of the claims***

The pending claims are 1 to 20. Claims 21 to 36 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to election/restriction and are canceled herein. Claims 1-3, and 7-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 4-6 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to advance the prosecution by more distinctly setting forth that the radiation sensing element is part of a calibrating system. The amendments are supported *passim* by the application, but for example, with particularity at page 15, line 13 to page 18, line 33. No new matter has been introduced.

#### ***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b): Claims 1 to 3 and 7***

Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0035858 ("*Johnson*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

*Johnson* discloses an LED display with photosensors to detect ambient light, and means to compensate for the ambient light. The photosensors of *Johnson* are intended to avoid measuring the light emitted from the diodes of the display (1) by measuring the ambient light, for example, prior to the "real display" of images, or (2) by shielding the photosensor from radiation to be emitted by electroluminescent pixels. See *Johnson* page 1, paragraphs [0008] and [0009]. Unlike the ambient radiation-sensing element of *Johnson*, the radiation-sensing element of amended independent claim 1 is intended to measure the emission from the radiation-emitting element of the device.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that *Johnson* is not available as a § 102 reference against the claims under review, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### ***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b): Claims 1 and 8 to 19***

Claims 1 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application Publication No. EP 0 966 018 ("*Pichler*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

*Pichler* discloses a display device comprising a primary light-emissive region, a light-sensitive region and a secondary light-emissive region. The primary light-emissive region emits light which is detected by a photocathode of the light-sensitive region, which releases

Application No.: 10/646,306  
Docket No.: UC0206USNA

Page 6

charged particles causing the secondary light-emissive region to emit light towards a viewer. See *Pichler* page 2, paragraphs [0002] and [0005], and FIGs. 1 and 2. The photocathode of *Pichler* is not part of a calibrating system as claimed in amended independent claim 1. Nowhere in the device of *Pichler* is a calibrating system used. The photocathode sensor of *Pichler* acts to intensify the light supplied to it from the primary light-emissive panel by accelerating electrons from the photocathode toward the secondary light-emissive panel. See *Pichler* page 4, paragraph [0023]. *Pichler* is silent on any type of calibration for variations in luminous intensity.

Similarly, for amended independent claims 8 and 16, the photocathode of *Pichler* is not part of a calibrating system, as claimed by Applicants in the amended claims.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that *Pichler* is not available as a § 102 reference against the claims under review, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 4 to 6 and 20***

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pichler* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0122749 ("*Booth*"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pichler* in view of *Booth* in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0174116 ("*Lu*"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pichler* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0134171 ("*Kobayashi*")

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in light of the remarks presented above demonstrating that *Pichler* is not available as a § 102 reference against amended independent claims 1 and 16, from which claims 4 to 6 and 20 depend.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, *Booth* discloses a display device in which an OLED emits light under forward bias and can detect energy under reverse bias. The radiation-emitting circuit and radiation-sensing circuit of *Booth* are part of the same circuit and are not the device as claimed in claim 1, as amended, in the above referenced application. See *Booth* FIGs. 4 and 5. In addition, the combination of *Pichler* and *Booth* do not teach or suggest the device of claim 1, and thus do not teach or suggest the device of claims 4 and 5 which depend from claim 1.

Regarding claims 6 and 20, both *Lu* and *Kobayashi* disclose transparent electrodes for an organic electronic devices. The transparent electrodes of *Lu* and *Kobayashi* are not radiation-sensing elements that are part of a calibrating system. Therefore, neither *Lu* nor *Kobayashi* make up for the deficiencies of *Pichler*, and their combination with *Pichler* do not teach or suggest either of the devices of claims 1 or 16, and thus do not teach or suggest either of the devices of claims 6 and 20 which depend from claims 1 and 16, respectively. There is no teaching or suggestion in any of *Pichler*, *Lu*, and *Kobayashi* of a radiation-sensing element that is part of a calibrating system.

Application No.: 10/646,306  
Docket No.: UC0206USNA


Page 7

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the above referenced rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the above referenced application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for the pending claims is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
JOHN H. LAMMING  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS  
Registration No.: 34,857  
Telephone: (302) 992-5877  
Facsimile: (302) 892-1026

Dated: June 8, 2006